

REMARKS

Before addressing the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that they have spent considerable time and effort responding to the various rejections on the references and the numerous combinations thereof. If the Examiner feels that this amendment does not put the case in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request an interview to discuss the action and this response prior to the issuance of any final rejection.

In Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 42 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner stated various reasons for the rejection. Applicants have amended claim 42 to recite different features than claim 41. The features now claimed are described in paragraph [0030] on page 4 of Applicants' specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced and this claim is now in good form.

In paragraph 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 USC § 102 (b) being anticipated by Ojeda (US 6,065,253). For the reasons discussed below and in view of claim 1 as now presented, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by Ojeda.

Ojeda discloses a playhouse kit which includes a building constructed of thin light weight materials with dry eraser surfaces provided on both the interior and exterior surfaces thereof. The building is constructed using members forming walls, roof, and floor of a house shape structure while the members to construct the house are attached to each other utilizing Velcro.sub.TM. or any other securable attachment means. Numerous magnetically attachable accessories are provided including thematic accessories and/or any accessories

which would may interest the child's imagination. In addition to the accessories numerous dry eraser markers in various colors are provided that allows the child to draw on or decorate the interior or exterior surfaces of the playhouse as desired.

Applicants can find no teaching in Ojeda which suggests that the playhouse kit and the doll house of Ojeda is an appliance or, more particularly, an electrical appliance. As stated at paragraph 29, page 4, of Applicants' disclosure, the magnetic sheet 12 is for adherence to an appliance 18 (Fig. 2). The ordinary meaning of the term "appliance" includes a device or instrument, especially one operated by electricity. Such appliances are common for household use, such as in a kitchen. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the appliance is an electrical appliance and to focus this claim to a purpose of the invention which is to change the appearance of a surface of the electrical appliance. For all the foregoing reasons and in view of the claims as now presented, Applicants respectively submit that claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by Ojeda.

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 10, 31, 38-42, 45-47, 52, and 59-63 under 35USC section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. (US 3,525,190) in view of Ojeda. The Examiner stated various reasons for the rejection. For the reasons discussed above and below, in view of the rejected claims as now presented, Applicants respectively submit that the rejected claims are not unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda.

Saunders et al. discloses an appliance door trim and panel mounting assembly including vertical and horizontal trim members supported on each edge of a front surface of an appliance door closure. Each of the vertical and horizontal trim members include first

and second legs covering a door edge. A smooth outer surface mounting pin on the trim member is adjustably mounted in an axial bore of a plastic grommet seated in interlocked relationship with the front surface of the door to hold the trim members in place and to allow insertion of a panel in juxtaposed relationship with the front surface of the door closure merely by removal of a the top horizontal trim member.

As stated at MPEP 706.02(j), page 700-45, to support a conclusion that a claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or implyably suggest the claimed invention or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. Also, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Moreover, even as combined, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. The prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations and not be based upon Applicants' disclosure.

Here, Applicants can find no suggestion or motivation which would suggest that these references can or should be combined as suggested by the Examiner. Even as combined the references still fail to teach of Applicants' claims, as now presented. Note that the Saunders et al. reference concerns a refrigerator door trim and panel mounting strip. As stated at column 1, lines 49 et seq, the object of the invention was to simplify the installation of removable door decorative panels on the front surface of an appliance door closure member by including a plurality of separate trim members that can be inserted in on

and removed from the front edges of the door closure member without the use of tools or the requirement of special installation training. It appears that the problem that Saunders et al. was trying to overcome in the prior art was to reduce the cost of manufacturing by providing standardize components of the finished appliances whereby a particular component, such as a door closure member, can be used on a wide number of different appliance models. Apparently, arrangements for fastenings prior to the Saunders et al. reference was to include screw elements, clip connectors and the like, all of which required special procedures and tools to install, as stated at column 1, lines 46-49.

Moreover, as stated at column 3, lines 1-4, the upper door 12 of Saunders et al. comprises a decorative panel 24 that overlies the front of the door 12 and a panel 24' is secured by the trim components in place of the lower door 14. As stated at column 4, lines 44-50, if it is desired to insert a panel, such as panel 24, the upper horizontal trim member 20 and the trim member 16 are removed merely by applying finger pressure to the trim strips and pulling straight out from the front.

If Ojeda were combined with Saunders et al. as the Examiner suggests, there would be no need for the replaceable or removable panels 24 of Saunders et al., which in turn would arguably eliminate the need for the trim.

Finally, Applicants can find no teaching that suggests that the playhouse of Ojeda be combined with the trim system of Saunders et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the skilled artisan of Saunders et al. would not look to the playhouse art or to systems for enabling children to decorate a playhouse and vice-versa, the Ojeda skilled artisan would not look to the art of Saunders et al.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims rejected in Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action are Patentable over the cited references.

In Paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 6, 7, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojeda in view of Nesbitt (U.S. 5,549,938). The Examiner stated various reasons for the rejection. For the reasons discussed above relative to Ojeda, in view of the claims as now presented, and for the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

Nesbitt discloses a removable camouflage primarily for hunting and military vehicles, which removable camouflage is characterized in a first preferred embodiment by a flexible, elastomeric magnetic panel having a selected camouflage pattern provided thereon. The camouflage panel is designed to magnetically attach to a steel surface such as the panels of a truck or other vehicle to facilitate quick and easy camouflaging of the vehicle without damaging or altering the paint on the vehicle. In another preferred embodiment the removable camouflage includes multiple, irregularly-shaped camouflage plates, also constructed of a magnetic material having a selected camouflage pattern thereon and capable of being attached to the steel surfaces of a vehicle to camouflage the vehicle. The camouflage pattern can be imprinted on the flexible magnetic material itself or on a vinyl overlay laminated on the flexible magnetic material.

It appears that the object of the Nesbitt device is to provide a removable magnetic camouflage for a vehicle having steel body panels, which camouflage is characterized by a flexible magnetic base material having a suitable camouflage pattern provide thereon, as stated at Column 2, Lines 36 – 40. The prior art apparently taught of painting the vehicle,

but this was unsatisfactory for the occasional hunter who used his pickup for activities other than hunting. Accordingly, the Nesbitt apparatus overcome this problem by providing a removable camouflage primarily for hunting in military vehicles, which removable camouflage was characterized in one embodiment by a flexible, elastomeric magnetic panel having a selected camouflage pattern provided thereon, as stated in the Abstract and in the description of the prior art of Nesbitt.

In contrast, Applicants invention covered by rejected claims 6, 7, 13 and 15 consists of a sheet magnet that is used to decorate an electric appliance where the sheet magnet comprises at least one decorative pattern on a first side of the sheet. The claim 1 from which the rejected claims depend recites that the magnetic sheet covers at least a portion of one surface to change the appearance of the surface from an original appearance to a decorated appearance.

Applicants can find no teaching in Ojeda which suggests that a playhouse could or should be combined with the truck camouflage apparatus of Nesbitt. Likewise, Applicants can find no teaching in Nesbitt that suggests the camouflage be applied to the toy dollhouse of Ojeda.

Moreover, even if it were obvious to combine the references as the Examiner seems to suggest, the resulting combination would still fail to teach of the independent claim 1 for a magnetic sheet that is used to cover at least a portion of one surface of an electrical appliance to change the appearance of the surface from an original appearance to a decorated appearance. Thus, even it were obvious to modify Ojeda with Nesbitt, the

resulting combination would be a camouflaged dollhouse, not a magnetic sheet for applying to an electrical appliance.

Further, Applicants believe that Nesbitt is also non-analogous prior art in that the Nesbitt reference is not in the field of Applicants endeavor. Further, the problem that Nesbitt seeks to overcome is the camouflaging of a truck, not providing a decorative pattern for an electrical appliance, for example, that is used in a kitchen of a household.

The combination of these references is further believed to be non-obvious if one considers that a child presumably would not desire to camouflage his/her dollhouse because the child is not trying to hide it, but rather the intent of Ojeda is to enable a child to "express his/her imagination by marking on the interior and exterior surfaces of the playhouse, ..." as stated at column 1, lines 20 – 25 of Ojeda.

Again, Applicants respectfully submit that the playhouse kit of Ojeda is not an electrical appliance. Thus, even as combined with Nesbitt, the combination fails to teach of Applicants invention as now claimed in claim 1 and the dependent claims 6, 13 and 15 that depend either directly or indirectly from claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7, 13 and 15 are not unpatentable over Ojeda in view of Nesbitt.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(as) as being unpatentable over Ojeda. For the reasons stated above, in view of the claim 1 as now presented, and also for the following reasons, Applicants believe claims 10 and 11 are not unpatentable over Ojeda.

Applicants respectfully point out that Applicants are not claiming the limitation of claim 10 and 11 alone per se, but rather these limitations are being claimed in combination with the elements of claim 1 from which they depend. For the reasons mentioned earlier, Applicants believe that Ojeda is not analogous prior art and does not teach of Applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1, 10 and 11. Applicants respectfully submit that it is not well-known in the art to decorate a surface of a magnetic sheet with a single or multiple color patterns in order to allow the user to change the decorative appearance of an electrical appliance as is required by claims 10 and 11. Indeed, it appears that the Examiner's rejection is based upon hindsight based upon the teaching of Applicants' disclosure, and the use of such hindsight is improper.

Applicants further respectfully submit that even if it were obvious to modify Ojeda as proposed by the Examiner, the resulting modification fails to teach of a sheet magnet for covering an electrical appliance as recited in claims 1, 10 and 11, from which these claims depend. Indeed, the resulting modification proposed by the Examiner would apparently result in a dollhouse having a single color or multiple color pattern which is contrary to the purpose of the dollhouse which is, in part, to provide a child with a house to mark on.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 are not unpatentable over Ojeda.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojeda in view of Nesbitt, and further in view of Ozgen et al. (U.S. 6,273,660). The Examiner stated various reasons for the rejection. For the reasons discussed earlier herein relative to the Ojeda and Nesbitt references, in view of

the claims 1, 13 and 14 as now presented, and further in view of the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that claim 14 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

Ozgen et al. discloses a flexible magnetic insert for a magazine or a periodical is provided which may be bound directly into the magazine or periodical and which provides a plurality of individual magnetized advertisements or coupons that can be removed and placed upon a metal surface such as a refrigerator or file cabinet. The magnetized sheet includes advertising, informational or decorative indicia on both its top and bottom sides. The sheet is perforated so that the individualized advertisements or coupons can be easily separated. In short, the invention apparently provides an improved means for distributing magnetized advertisements and coupons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' claim 12 is not claiming a line of weakness alone, but rather, Applicants' claim 14 is claiming a magnetic sheet having a sheet magnet that comprises at least one line of weakness, as recited in Applicants' claim 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching which suggests that the Ojeda, Nesbitt and Ozgen et al. references be combined. For example, Applicants can find no teaching in any of the references that suggests that any of the accessories in the Ojeda reference could or should be provided with perforations/lines of weakness because, for example, the simulated wallpaper material of Ojeda is provided such that they are "dimensioned and shaped to fit a wall surface" of the dollhouse, as stated at column 3, lines 24 – 26. Thus, there would be no need, suggestion or teaching that supports the

Examiner's suggestion that the perforations of Ozgen et al. be applied to either of the devices of Ojeda or the Nesbitt.

Further, note that the Ozgen et al. reference concerns a magnetized sheet that is perforated so that individualized advertisements or coupons can be easily separated. The magnetized sheet of Applicants' claim 14 requires that the sheet magnet comprise the thickness of .015 inch – 0.030 inch and that it comprise at least one line of weakness. Applicants' line of weakness facilitates folding the magnetized sheet over, for example, an edge or corner or separating excess material from the magnetized sheet which is applied onto the electrical appliance. Note that in the Ozgen et al. reference, the various advertising portions of the magnetic inserts are separated and the sheet is perforated so that individualized advertisements or coupons can be easily separated.

Even it were obvious to combine this reference with the other references (which Applicants believe it is not), the resulting combination still fails to teach of Applicants' claim 1, from which claim 14 indirectly depends. In this regard, note that the claim 1 is directed to a magnetic sheet that comprises a decorative pattern that is for use on an electrical appliance. Applicants claim 1 further requires that the sheet magnet cover at least a portion of one surface of the electrical appliance so that the at least a portion of one surface is covered by the decoration to change the appearance of the electrical appliance from an original appearance to a decorative pattern. As mentioned in Ozgen et al., the magnetic pieces that combined cover one page of a magazine and are intended to provide advertising information. These pieces do not provide a magnetic sheet to decorate at least one surface of an electrical appliance as recited in claim 1.

For all the foregoing reasons and for the reasons mentioned earlier herein, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojeda in view of Carter, and further in view of Nesbitt. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the arguments made above relative to these references, in view of claim 16 as now presented, from which claims 20 and 21 directly depend, and also for the following reasons.

For the reasons noted above, Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion which suggests that Ojeda be combined with either Carter or Nesbitt. For example, Applicants can find no teaching in any of these references that suggests that the tissue paper pattern of Carter be combined with the removable camouflage of Nesbitt, that is then, in turn, used on a toy dollhouse as seems to be the Examiner's suggestion. Again, even if were obvious to make such an elaborate combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the resulting combination fails to teach of Applicants magnetic sheet as now claimed in claims 20 and 21 and their respective independent claim 16.

For all the foregoing reasons and for the reasons mentioned earlier, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 and 21 are not unpatentable over the cited references.

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32 – 35, 48 – 51 and 53 – 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda, and further in view of Carter. For the reasons mentioned earlier herein relative to the Saunders et al., Ojeda and Carter references, in view of the

independent claims as now presented, and also for the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not unpatentable over the cited references.

In addition to the reasons mentioned earlier, Applicants can find no teaching which suggests that the trim invention of Saunders et al. be combined with the Ojeda playhouse, and as mentioned earlier, such a combination would appear to destroy the teaching of either one or both references.

Even if it were obvious to combine the references as the Examiner seems to suggest, the resulting combination still fails to teach of the rejected claims. The suggested modification would appear to destroy the teaching of Saunders et al. and Ojeda. For example, as the Examiner recognizes, the Saunders et al. reference teaches of switching out panels 24 to change the appearance of the device. There would be no need to provide the trim and mechanism of the Saunders et al. reference if magnetic sheets were used to cover the Saunders et al. panels 24. Further, Ojeda does not teach of providing magnetic sheets to cover an exterior surface of an electrical appliance. Thus, the suggested combination would still fail to teach of Applicants' claim 1, for example, which requires a magnetic sheet that is applied to a surface of an electrical appliance to decorate the surface.

Also, Applicants can find no teaching in Saunders et al., Ojeda or Carter which suggests that the trim features of Saunders et al. be combined with the paper tissue pattern of Carter. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation for combining a paper tissue pattern (apparently used for dress making) with the trim panel of Saunders et al. or the playhouse of Ojeda. Again, even if it were obvious to combine these references (which

Applicants believe it is not), the resulting combination would still fail to teach of a magnetic sheet for covering at least a portion of one surface of an electrical appliance as is required by claim 16.

For the foregoing reasons and for the reasons mentioned earlier herein and in view of the rejected claims as now presented, Applicants believe that the rejected claims are not unpatentable over the cited references.

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda and Carter, and further in view of Nesbitt. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons stated above relative to these references and also for the following reasons.

There is simply no teaching in any of these references that suggests that the trim piece of Saunders et al. be combined with the dollhouse of Ojeda, the paper tissue of Carter or the truck camouflage system of Nesbitt. Applicants again respectfully submit that even if it were obvious to combine these references, they still fail to teach of the invention as claimed in claim 27 and claims 23 and 16 from which it depends. For example, claim 27 recites that the magnetic sheet comprises a thickness of .05 inch - .03 inch and the claim 23 from which claim 23 depends recites that the electrical appliance is a kitchen appliance. None of these references teach of the combination of features as recited in claims 1, 23 and 27, regardless of whether the cited references are taken alone or in combination. Thus, even it were obvious to combine these references as suggested, they would not result in a system for changing the appearance of an electrical appliance wherein the system comprises a magnetic sheet, a grid pattern on the sheet wherein the magnetic sheet covers

the at least one surface of the appliance so that the surface becomes decorated by the decoration as Applicants have claimed. Again, the Examiner appears to be using the teaching of Applicants' disclosure to provide such combination and such use is not proper.

Applicants have further clarified that the embodiment of claim 16 comprises a that the grid pattern situated on at least one side of the magnetic sheet.

For all the foregoing reasons and for the reasons mentioned earlier herein relative to these references and further in view of claim 16 as now presented, Applicants believe that claim 27 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

In Paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojeda in view of Carter, and further in view of Ozgen et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amended claim 16 from which claim 28 depends, in view of the arguments made above relative to the cited references, and also for the following reasons.

Again, there is simply no teaching that suggests that the playhouse of Ojeda be combined with the paper tissue pattern of Carter and then further combined with the advertising system of Ozgen et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that even if it were obvious to combine these references as suggested, the references would still fail to teach of Applicants' invention as now covered by claim 28. Again, combining the tissue paper pattern of Carter with the advertising perforations of Ozgen et al. would not result in a magnetic sheet that can be applied to an electrical appliance to change the appearance of the appliance. Also, the

modification of Ojeda with Carter and Ozgen et al. would not result in a magnetic sheet that is applied to an electrical appliance.

The Examiner mentioned that Ojeda, as viewed in combination with Carter, would provide a line of weakness for the purpose of allowing the user to easily separate the magnet into smaller portions. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching in either Ojeda or Carter which suggests that anything in Ojeda be provided with perforation. Indeed, the Ojeda reference, as mentioned earlier herein, seems to teach that the various accessories that the children use to play with the dollhouse in Ojeda are "dimensioned" to fit the dollhouse, thereby eliminating the need for lines of weakness as claimed in Applicants' claim 28.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to the "may be folded" language based on functionality, Applicants have deleted this language from the claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, and for the reasons mentioned earlier herein relative to the cited references, Applicants believe claim 28 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

In Paragraph 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 36, 37, 43, 57, 58, 64 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda, and further in view of Nesbitt. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons stated above relative to these references.

In Paragraph 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda, and further in view of Ozgen et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons stated

above relative to these references, in view of the claim as now presented, and also for the following reasons.

In addition to the arguments mentioned earlier, Applicants respectfully submit that the Ozgen et al. reference does not provide a magnetic sheet for decorating at least a portion of one surface of an electrical appliance. Indeed, the function of the Ozgen et al. device is to permit a plurality of advertisements 51 – 58 to be separated by a user who may then place the various advertisements onto a refrigerator for later reference. The perforation lines are provided on the Ozgen et al. reference apparently to enable the user to easily separate the various advertisements. The various advertisements in the Ozgen et al. reference appear to be to provide just that, namely, advertisements, not a decorative pattern or decoration that covers a surface of the appliance as required by claim 44.

Note also that claim 44 depends from claim 41 which requires that the magnetic sheet comprise a decorative pattern comprising multiple colors. In contrast, the various advertisements appear to provide advertising information, not a multiple-colored decorative pattern of the type used to cover the surface of an electrical appliance in order to change the appearance of the external surface of the electrical appliance as covered by the rejected claim 44.

For all the foregoing reasons mentioned earlier herein and also in view of the claims as now presented, Applicants believe claim 44 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

In Paragraph 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. in view of Ojeda and Nesbitt,

and further in view of Ozgen et al. For the reasons stated above relative to the references, in view of the claim 65 as now presented, and also for the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

There is no teaching which suggests that the various references, which appear to be from unrelated fields of art be combined as the Examiner has suggested. Further, there is no suggestion or teaching that these references can be combined without destroying the teaching of the references. As mentioned earlier, for example, it would appear that the Saunders et al. teaching would be destroyed if it were modified by Ojeda and Nesbitt and Ozgen et al., because there would be no further need for the Saunders et al. trim piece if the panels 24 were covered with a magnetic sheet as the Examiner seems to suggest.

Moreover, even assuming arguendo that it were obvious to combine these references as proposed, Applicants still fail to see how the resulting combination teaches of the electrical appliance as covered by claim 52, from which claim 65 indirectly depends. Note that claim 52 requires an electrical appliance; a magnetic sheet; and at least one decorative pattern on a first side of the magnetic sheet and where the magnetic sheet covers at least one surface of the electrical appliance so that the surface is covered by the decorations to change the appearance of the electrical appliance. It would appear that the Examiner is using the teaching of Applicants' disclosure to modify the references as suggested and such use is improper. For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit claim 65 is also not unpatentable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected claims are patentable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully submit that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner indicate his consideration of the foreign reference, WO 98000616, by initialing form PTO/SB/08A. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants are submitting a copy of the PTO/SB/08A form. This reference was previously cited and submitted, but not initialed by the Examiner.

Applicants are filing concurrently under separate cover a request for a three (3) month extension of time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1287. Applicants hereby provide a general request for any extension of time which may be required at any time during the prosecution of the application. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any fees which have not been previously paid for by check and which are required during the prosecution of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-1287. (Should Deposit Account No. 50-1287 be deficient, please charge any

further deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 10-0220).

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned via telephone with any questions or comments regarding this case. Applicants also request an interview prior to the issuance of any final rejection if this Amendment does not put the application in condition for allowance.


Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Response to Office Action
of June 18, 2003
Serial No. 10/092,780

-35-

Respectfully submitted,

JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS

By 
Matthew R. Jenkins
Reg. No. 34,844

2310 Far Hills Building
Dayton, Ohio 45419-1575
Telephone 937: 298-2811

December 15, 2003

MRJ:rl